

THE W. F. CIGAR

TEN-CENT CIGAR.

Sub Rosa! Sub Rosa!

THE FLORENCE 10-CENT CIGAR.

PATTON BROS., STATE AGENTS

RICHMOND, IND.

THROUGH TARIFF SLASHED

Freight Rates Cut by the Kanawha Dispatch and the National Dispatch.

Business of Trunk Lines from New York to the Mississippi Affected—Local Freightmen Disturbed.

There has been a big reduction of freight rates out of New York to all Mississippi river points. This will be regarded as the first serious menace to rates in the territory of the Trunk-Line Association and that of the Central Traffic Association. The reductions were by the Kanawha Dispatch and the Savannah Steamship line. They made a clean cut of 50 per cent. on dry goods and certain other first-class products from New York to the Mississippi river, which is the junction between the Eastern and Western associations. The Savannah line's rate is 30 cents per one hundred pounds, the old rate being 75 cents. The Kanawha Dispatch, which runs over the Chesapeake & Ohio road, went one better and put in a rate of 25 cents. The National Dispatch, which is a Grand Trunk line, anticipated the low rates of the above mentioned companies by making on Wednesday a rate of 30 cents. Its former rate was 50 cents. The object is to reach points west of the Mississippi river, so that the standard rates of the Western roads and to be added to the reduced rates. From the Mississippi river to Kansas City, for example, the first-class rate is 55 cents. The same rate cutters have also reduced the tariff on all cotton goods from the mills. The National Dispatch has also put into effect a 25-cent rate between New York and the Mississippi river, and its competitors are expected to follow suit. It will be readily seen that the trunk lines cannot long resist this warfare in their own country without being forced to accept a more liberal policy. The National Dispatch threatens the Northern and the Kanawha Dispatch the intermediate territory.

An Important Investigation.

An investigation into railway management will be commenced by the federal grand jury at Chicago on Monday next. This promises to be the most far-reaching and thorough inquiry into the affairs of the big railroad companies that has ever been undertaken by the Interstate-commerce Commission, and it is said to be an inquiry only to be begun after diligent study of the situation by the commissioners and Attorney-general Olney. Some of those on whom subpoenas have been served are: G. B. Blanchard, chairman Central Traffic Association; F. C. Donald, vice chairman Western Traffic Association; R. W. Caldwell, chairman Eastern Traffic Association; W. B. White, passenger traffic manager of the Atchafalpa; C. S. Crane, assistant passenger agent Wabash railway; George A. Charleston, president of the Chicago & North Western; J. H. Smith, manager of the Lackawanna line. Most, if not all, the ticket brokers in the association have been also served. Complaints of both passenger and freight discriminations have been made to the commission. It is said, however, that the investigation is not so much a matter of inquiry as of inquiry and the rates fixed by the various fast freight lines. The Attorney-general has detailed attorney A. G. Safford from Washington to aid District Attorney Mitchell in the work.

Disturbs the Line Men.

The announcement that the Lake Shore and Lehigh Valley Dispatch will establish an office at this point, and handle business east and west from Indianapolis, and this territory has considerably disturbed the fast freight line agents at this point, who represent some fifteen fast freight lines. This dispatch is known as John Newell's fast freight line, and was established when he was displeased that the Traders' Dispatch, which sent its business over the Lake Shore and the Lehigh Valley, was doing so little. This was two years ago, and the line has been working over the Lake Shore and the Lehigh Valley out of Chicago since, but is looked upon as being a disturber, hence the fast freight line men here dislike to have it for a competitor in the territory. However, it opens an excellent line for the Big Four into central Pennsylvania, Philadelphia and many points on the Philadelphia & Reading, which lines are operated by the Big Four out of reach, except by the Central Dispatch, which sends its business over the Baltimore & Ohio.

No Cheap Excursions for the Present.

There will be no world's fair excursion trains from the West before Aug. 1. Whether there will be any after that time depends on circumstances. This applies only to the lines in the Western Passenger Association. The Atchafalpa and the Alton may run excursion trains before that time. The matter of cheap excursions to the fair was the only thing considered at the association meeting in Chicago yesterday. It was agreed that no cheap excursion trains should be run before July 25, and that if an agreement was reached at a meeting of the association to be held in St. Louis, the roads would be free to take individual action in the matter provided any road wishing to run cheap excursion trains shall give five days' notice to the Western Passenger Association. No notice of such an excursion can be given before July 15, and that means Aug. 1 before excursions can run from the West to the fair, unless they come over the Atchafalpa or Alton. These two roads have been waiting the action of the association, and are not prepared to say at once just what they will do.

The Firemen's Brotherhood.

One of the most prosperous railway organizations is the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen. The last quarterly report of the grand treasurer and treasurer is out, and is an unusually interesting document. It shows a total membership of 28,242, a net increase for the last quarter over withdrawals and expulsions of 629 members. The total balance in the hands of the treasurer, beneficiary and special funds, is \$78,540.44. This sum is in addition to the protective fund, which amounts to about \$100,000. The above statistics indicate a healthy growth, and it is said the affairs of the association were never moving along more harmoniously, and not in years have the firemen had so few grievances against the managements of the roads employing them.

What the Monon Will Earn.

W. H. McDool, general manager of the Louisville, New Albany & Chicago, has prepared a statement (estimating June) for the fiscal year ending June 30, based on actual earnings of eleven of the twelve months. This statement shows gross earnings, \$3,327,657; dividends, Chicago & Western Indiana railroad, \$60,000; dividends, Rock Island Company, \$14,000. Total gross earnings, \$3,401,657; operating expenses, 67 1/2 per cent., \$2,298,542; net earnings, \$1,103,115; fixed charges, including interest, rentals, etc., \$448,087; surplus, \$153,488.

Personal, Local and General Notes.

Thomas Noonan, general manager of the Central States Dispatch, will return to-day from the East. The Pennsylvania road has put one of its large steam shovels and two construction trains at work on the Michigan division, which is to be

WAR BETWEEN THE COURTS

Judge Bartholomew Declines to Take Cognizance of Judge Baker's Order.

Why a Juror Was Put Out of the Box—Color Line Drawn in a Restaurant—Court Miscellany.

IT GOES MERRILY ON.

No Cessation or Compromise in the War Between the Courts.

The war between the State and federal courts goes merrily on, both Judge Bartholomew and Judge Baker exhibiting disposition to proceed with the case of Pullman against the L. E. & W. railroad as originally undertaken by each court. Judge Baker has issued a restraining order to prevent the plaintiff from proceeding further with his case in the State court, and to proceed in the face of this order simply means confinement in the jail for contempt of court. Judge Bartholomew still maintains that Judge Baker has no jurisdiction in the case and refuses to recognize his authority to control the action of the State court.

Yesterday morning William V. Rooker,

attorney for Pullman, appeared in Judge Bartholomew's court and filed a petition asking that the case be dismissed from the court in order that he might proceed to the trial of the case in the federal court. In his petition Mr. Rooker stated that he desired to try the case in the State court, and not in the federal court, but that on account of the restraining order issued against his client he could not do so, and for this reason alone he asked that the case be dismissed. Judge Bartholomew refused to allow the dismissal, to which ruling Mr. Rooker took exception, and was allowed ten days within which to file his bill of exceptions. Judge Bartholomew then continued the case in his court, and proceeded with the trial of the case, and the case will probably be carried to the Supreme Court as a test case.

JUROR PUT OUT OF THE BOX.

James Whisner's "Peers" Declined to Serve with Him.

A few days ago, when the case of Patrick Shea against the Indianapolis Natural Gas Company, for damages, was on trial in the Superior Court, one of the jurors was excused on account of his being a witness for the defense, and on account of statements made by him, was removed from the regular panel. When the case named was on trial for trial Mr. Deane, of the firm of Beckwith & Deane, who appeared for the plaintiff, propounded to the jury the questions touching their competence to try the case. One of the first jurors examined was James Whisner, who was asked if he knew anything about the facts in the case and if he did not, he was asked if he was a neighbor of the plaintiff, who was suing for damages for injuries to two of his children from the explosion of a gas pipe in the house of the plaintiff. After examining the jury, it was passed by Mr. Deane to Mr. Egan, who appeared for the defendant. "You will have to excuse Mr. Whisner from the jury," said Mr. Egan, "as he is one of our witnesses."

Mr. Whisner was excused, and testified

on behalf of the defendants in the case, the trial of which resulted in a verdict for the plaintiff for a small amount.

Yesterday morning Mr. Whisner, who is

on the regular panel, took his seat in the jury box, but the remainder of the jury refused to sit with him, as by their verdict in the Shea case they said they believed he testified falsely in that case. Judge Winters excused him from the panel, and another was substituted.

DREW THE COLOR LINE.

Negro Barber Sues a Restaurant for Alleged Discrimination.

There is at least one eating house in this city conducted on Southern principles, where the color line is very closely drawn, as was demonstrated by a suit filed yesterday afternoon against Bert Little, proprietor of the chophouse at No. 605 Virginia avenue, near the Fountain square. The plaintiff in the suit is William E. Givens, the proprietor of a barber shop at No. 517 Virginia avenue. In his complaint Givens alleges that Little is the proprietor of the restaurant at the given number and that a public house. He alleges that a few days ago he and his wife, who are colored, went to the restaurant for breakfast, and at the time there were several other persons in the place. The plaintiff says he was dressed neatly and conducted himself in a proper manner, and gave his order for breakfast, consisting of bread, coffee and potatoes, and that he paid for the same. He says he was then seated at a table, and was waiting for his food, when he was told by the waiter that he was not allowed to sit at that table, as it was reserved for white people. He says he was then told to go to the back of the restaurant, and that he was not allowed to sit at that table, as it was reserved for white people. He says he was then told to go to the back of the restaurant, and that he was not allowed to sit at that table, as it was reserved for white people.

Evidence heard in the trial instituted by

Justice Daniels yesterday afternoon heard the evidence in the case against Robert Keller, proprietor of the grocery and dry-goods store at the corner of Corn and East streets, and E. H. Roder, at the corner of Noble and South streets. The men were arrested upon affidavits procured at the instance of the Retail Merchants' Commercial Association in their efforts to enforce a Sunday-closing rule. John M. Bailey appeared for Roder, and Hawkins & Smith for Keller. Both admit the sale of goods upon Sunday, and introduce no evidence in defense, but will maintain that it was necessary in the case of Roder to say that it was milk that he sold, and it will be argued in his behalf that the home-keeper could not keep the milk overnight. The cases will be argued Monday afternoon.

Coy, Lanham and Hier.

Sim Coy, Ollie Lanham and Fred Hier will appear before Judge Baker, this morning, to answer to the charge of violation of the internal revenue laws. It seems that when Coy transferred his roadhouse to Lanham & Hier, the latter also purchased his government liquor license and failed to conform with the laws by having the license changed.

Suit for Damages.

A jury in Room 3 of the Superior Court is listening to the evidence in the case of Charles Decker against the Atlas engine works for \$5,000 damages for the loss of an eye from the bursting of a drill press which he was operating. Sunday-closing rule is in Room 3 and resulted in a verdict in favor of Decker for a small amount. A new trial was granted and the case removed to Room 3.

Street-Car Damage Suit.

Reichford & Reardon, as attorneys for Caroline Henry, yesterday filed suit against the street-car company, asking damages in the sum of \$10,000 for injuries received in an accident at the corner of Illinois and Seventh streets.

Another \$5,000 Dog Bite.

Theodore T. Oldendorf, Jr., as next friend for his son of the same name, has filed suit against Conrad Bauer, asking damages in the sum of \$5,000 for injuries received from a bite of a dog.

THE SUM OF \$5,000 FOR INJURIES RECEIVED

from the bite of a dog. The plaintiff charges that the defendant was the owner of a vicious spaniel, which, April 30, attacked and bit the plaintiff about the head and face.

Killed in a Freight Wreck. The body of W. E. Hancock, who was killed at Glen Allen, Mo., Thursday, in a freight wreck, arrived here yesterday, and was taken to Kraegel & White's morgue. The deceased has a sister living here, named Mrs. Ayres. A company of trainmen accompanied the body. The funeral will occur Monday afternoon.

Federal Officers.

Four United States prisoners will be arraigned before Judge Baker this morning on the charge of counterfeiting and violating the postal and internal revenue laws. Deputy Marshal Jones went to Noblesville after the offenders last night.

The Court Record.

SUPREME COURT OPINIONS. 16281. Alfred Barden et al. vs. Frank Overmyer. Fulton C. C. Affirmed. Hackney, J.—"Where a deed recites 'It is expressly declared and understood that the death of her children are to inherit her estate,' held that upon the death of either grantee the property went to the survivor. 2. An equitable estoppel never arises without proof that a wrong has been done or is threatened on the one side and injury suffered or reasonably apprehended on the other."

APPELLATE COURT OPINIONS.

721. Otto Durie et al. vs. Andia C. Brown. Perry C. C. Affirmed. Jett, J.—"The omission in a complaint to review of the day of the month on which the judgment was rendered does not make the complaint defective. 2. If an application to vacate a judgment is made at the term when the judgment was rendered no notice is necessary. After the term is passed notice is necessary, and the defendant to the original suit on account was not a necessary party to the action to review."

1008. Town of Matileto vs. Thomas R. Keard. Cass C. C. Affirmed. Gavin, C. J.—"An obstruction two feet high and occupying eight feet of ground in a principal street, in a town, with a one block business center imposed a duty upon the town of removing it during the three days prior to the injury caused thereby to the plaintiff, and for failure to do so it was liable."

842. Indianapolis Cabinet Company vs. Henry Herman, Marion S. C. Affirmed. Davis, J.—"Where the language is uncertain or ambiguous it is proper for the court in construing the contract and the rights of the parties thereunder to consider the situation of the parties at the time of the execution of the paper and their subsequent conduct under it, as giving a practical construction to it."

SUPERIOR COURT.

Room 1—James M. Winters, Judge Pro Tem. Robert D. Hobbs vs. John J. Mescall et al.; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 2—James W. Harper, Judge. Gustavus Reichel vs. Anna C. Reichel; divorce. Dismissed by plaintiff at his cost.

Room 3—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 4—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 5—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 6—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 7—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 8—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 9—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 10—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 11—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 12—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 13—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 14—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 15—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 16—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 17—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 18—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 19—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 20—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 21—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 22—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 23—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 24—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 25—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 26—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 27—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 28—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 29—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 30—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 31—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 32—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 33—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 34—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 35—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

THE SUM OF \$5,000 FOR INJURIES RECEIVED

from the bite of a dog. The plaintiff charges that the defendant was the owner of a vicious spaniel, which, April 30, attacked and bit the plaintiff about the head and face.

Killed in a Freight Wreck. The body of W. E. Hancock, who was killed at Glen Allen, Mo., Thursday, in a freight wreck, arrived here yesterday, and was taken to Kraegel & White's morgue. The deceased has a sister living here, named Mrs. Ayres. A company of trainmen accompanied the body. The funeral will occur Monday afternoon.

Federal Officers.

Four United States prisoners will be arraigned before Judge Baker this morning on the charge of counterfeiting and violating the postal and internal revenue laws. Deputy Marshal Jones went to Noblesville after the offenders last night.

The Court Record.

SUPREME COURT OPINIONS. 16281. Alfred Barden et al. vs. Frank Overmyer. Fulton C. C. Affirmed. Hackney, J.—"Where a deed recites 'It is expressly declared and understood that the death of her children are to inherit her estate,' held that upon the death of either grantee the property went to the survivor. 2. An equitable estoppel never arises without proof that a wrong has been done or is threatened on the one side and injury suffered or reasonably apprehended on the other."

APPELLATE COURT OPINIONS.

721. Otto Durie et al. vs. Andia C. Brown. Perry C. C. Affirmed. Jett, J.—"The omission in a complaint to review of the day of the month on which the judgment was rendered does not make the complaint defective. 2. If an application to vacate a judgment is made at the term when the judgment was rendered no notice is necessary. After the term is passed notice is necessary, and the defendant to the original suit on account was not a necessary party to the action to review."

1008. Town of Matileto vs. Thomas R. Keard. Cass C. C. Affirmed. Gavin, C. J.—"An obstruction two feet high and occupying eight feet of ground in a principal street, in a town, with a one block business center imposed a duty upon the town of removing it during the three days prior to the injury caused thereby to the plaintiff, and for failure to do so it was liable."

842. Indianapolis Cabinet Company vs. Henry Herman, Marion S. C. Affirmed. Davis, J.—"Where the language is uncertain or ambiguous it is proper for the court in construing the contract and the rights of the parties thereunder to consider the situation of the parties at the time of the execution of the paper and their subsequent conduct under it, as giving a practical construction to it."

SUPERIOR COURT.

Room 1—James M. Winters, Judge Pro Tem. Robert D. Hobbs vs. John J. Mescall et al.; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 2—James W. Harper, Judge. Gustavus Reichel vs. Anna C. Reichel; divorce. Dismissed by plaintiff at his cost.

Room 3—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 4—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 5—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 6—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 7—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 8—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 9—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 10—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 11—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 12—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 13—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 14—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 15—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 16—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 17—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 18—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 19—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 20—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 21—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 22—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 23—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 24—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 25—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 26—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 27—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 28—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 29—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 30—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 31—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 32—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 33—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 34—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 35—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

THE SUM OF \$5,000 FOR INJURIES RECEIVED

from the bite of a dog. The plaintiff charges that the defendant was the owner of a vicious spaniel, which, April 30, attacked and bit the plaintiff about the head and face.

Killed in a Freight Wreck. The body of W. E. Hancock, who was killed at Glen Allen, Mo., Thursday, in a freight wreck, arrived here yesterday, and was taken to Kraegel & White's morgue. The deceased has a sister living here, named Mrs. Ayres. A company of trainmen accompanied the body. The funeral will occur Monday afternoon.

Federal Officers.

Four United States prisoners will be arraigned before Judge Baker this morning on the charge of counterfeiting and violating the postal and internal revenue laws. Deputy Marshal Jones went to Noblesville after the offenders last night.

The Court Record.

SUPREME COURT OPINIONS. 16281. Alfred Barden et al. vs. Frank Overmyer. Fulton C. C. Affirmed. Hackney, J.—"Where a deed recites 'It is expressly declared and understood that the death of her children are to inherit her estate,' held that upon the death of either grantee the property went to the survivor. 2. An equitable estoppel never arises without proof that a wrong has been done or is threatened on the one side and injury suffered or reasonably apprehended on the other."

APPELLATE COURT OPINIONS.

721. Otto Durie et al. vs. Andia C. Brown. Perry C. C. Affirmed. Jett, J.—"The omission in a complaint to review of the day of the month on which the judgment was rendered does not make the complaint defective. 2. If an application to vacate a judgment is made at the term when the judgment was rendered no notice is necessary. After the term is passed notice is necessary, and the defendant to the original suit on account was not a necessary party to the action to review."

1008. Town of Matileto vs. Thomas R. Keard. Cass C. C. Affirmed. Gavin, C. J.—"An obstruction two feet high and occupying eight feet of ground in a principal street, in a town, with a one block business center imposed a duty upon the town of removing it during the three days prior to the injury caused thereby to the plaintiff, and for failure to do so it was liable."

842. Indianapolis Cabinet Company vs. Henry Herman, Marion S. C. Affirmed. Davis, J.—"Where the language is uncertain or ambiguous it is proper for the court in construing the contract and the rights of the parties thereunder to consider the situation of the parties at the time of the execution of the paper and their subsequent conduct under it, as giving a practical construction to it."

SUPERIOR COURT.

Room 1—James M. Winters, Judge Pro Tem. Robert D. Hobbs vs. John J. Mescall et al.; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 2—James W. Harper, Judge. Gustavus Reichel vs. Anna C. Reichel; divorce. Dismissed by plaintiff at his cost.

Room 3—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 4—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 5—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 6—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 7—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 8—Henry L. Baugher vs. Greenleaf V. Woolf; damages. On trial by jury.